Material: 36 (all from South West Africa, Ohopoho, Kaoko-Otavi,

Omaruru Rheboth, Erongo Mtn. etc.)

Range: From the Kaokoveld, south in the Namib Desert to western Damaraland, South West Africa. Not in the interior plateau.

Acknowledgements:

For the loan of additional material I am indebted to the Directors of the South African Museum, Cape Town (through Dr. J. M. Winterbottom); Transvaal Museum, Pretoria (through Mr. O. P. M. Prozesky), and the National Museum of Southern Rhodesia, Bulawayo (through Mr. M. P. Stuart Irwin). I am also indebted to Mr. P. A. Clancey, Director of the Durban Museum, for his assistance.

Additional notes on the Philippine Elegant Titmouse, Parus elegans

by Kenneth C. Parkes

Received 5th April, 1963

In my revision of the Elegant Titmouse, *Parus elegans* (Parkes, 1958), an endemic species of the Philippine archipelago, I used the name *P. e. visayanus* (Hachisuka) for a subspecies confined to the island of Cebu. In a paper on the birds of the latter island, Rabor (1959) called the Cebu titmice *P. e. albescens* (McGregor), a name which I had applied to the populations of Ticao (type locality), Masbate, Guimaras, and Negros, with the provision that Negros specimens were not quite typical. I considered the Cebu race *visayanus* most similar, not to *albescens* as might have been expected on geographic grounds, but to *P. e. elegans* of Luzon, Mindoro, and Panay.

Rabor's use of albescens for the Cebu population would imply that he considered these birds inseparable from those of Negros and the other islands listed above. His paper discusses the disappearance of a number of forest species following the almost total clearing of the land on Cebu. It occurred to me that the discrepancy in our identifications of Cebu titmice might be explained if P. e. visayanus had been extirpated, or nearly so, and Cebu repopulated with representatives of albescens from nearby Negros; at the time of my revision, only old specimens from Cebu were available to me. Through the courtesy of the authorities of the Chicago Natural History Museum and U.S. National Museum, I therefore assembled a series consisting of the five old Cebu specimens originally examined, plus four recent specimens from the same island. I also borrowed both old and new specimens from Negros, to supplement a series from Masbate in Carnegie Museum, considered typical of albescens. No topotypes of albescens from Ticao are known to exist at present (see Parkes, 1958: 101).

Recently taken specimens of *Parus elegans* from Cebu do not differ significantly from the older ones originally considered to represent *P. e. visayanus*. Re-examination of Negros birds shows that the population from that island is rather variable, and occasional males do approach *visayanus* to some extent. The sample as a whole, however, is clearly

closest to *albescens*. Direct comparison of *albescens* and *visayanus* in my 1958 paper was brief, and was confined to males (Parkes, 1958: 103). An expanded comparison may conveniently be given here.

Typical males of *albescens* are characterized by the great amount of white on the dorsum, and the especially large white spots on the tips of secondaries and wing-coverts. In Negros specimens this prevalence of white is somewhat less marked than in those from Masbate. The under parts of *albescens* are clear yellow, with little darkening on the flanks. In contrast, Cebu males show less white on the back, and smaller white spots on the wing, although some Negros males are close to *visayanus* in the latter character. Cebu males are distinctly duller yellow below than are those from Negros and Masbate, and have markedly darker greenishgrey flanks. Some Negros males have a pronounced yellow wash dorsally, affecting the dorsal spots and rump colour; this extreme is not reached by any Masbate *albescens* seen, and represents a tendency *away* from the colour of *visayanus*, which has a bluish or greyish rump.

In my 1958 paper, the black throat patch of albescens was stated to be less extensive than that of elegans (p. 101) or visayanus (p. 103). This character does not appear to be trustworthy; four Masbate males are rather consistent in having a somewhat restricted throat patch, but both Negros and Cebu males are highly variable in this respect, even when comparing skins of similar "make."

As for females, only a single rather poor specimen of visayanus was available at the time of my 1958 revision. Two additional specimens now confirm my statement that female visayanus "is very similar to elegans, differing chiefly in having greyer flanks and slightly less white spotting on the wings." Female albescens differ in being more generally yellowish rather than greyish-green dorsally, with yellow spots anteriorly; in having slightly larger white wing spots, and in being brighter, clearer yellow below, with little or no darkening on the flanks (as in males).

The respective ranges of *Parus elegans visayanus* and *P. e. albescens* may thus continue to stand as given in my 1958 paper, with the slight modifications in diagnostic characters noted above.

Deignan (1961: 341) has listed a specimen in the U.S. National Museum as the "type" of "P(arus). albescens Baird", 1858. This name, if nomenclatorially available, would jeopardize the later name Pardaliparus albescens McGregor, 1907, as used above. Baird's name appears only in an annotated table of contents (Baird, 1858: xxxvii), where the distribution of Parus septentrionalis is given in the following words: "Missouri river to the Rocky mountains, or else replaced there by P. albescens." The reader is referred to page 389, but the name albescens does not appear on that or any other page, except page xxxvii. Several specimens are mentioned on page 389, including one from New Mexico to which the name albescens was probably intended to apply, and to which Deignan has applied it. Ridgway (1904: 401) considered this name to be a nomen nudum, and such I believed it to be. In view of Deignan's formal recognition of a "type" of "albescens", however, I thought it best to get an expert opinion, and consulted Dr. Ernst Mayr. After carefully studying the situation, Dr. Mayr concurs with Ridgway that Baird's name is a nomen nudum and not available, pointing out that "there is no reference to any specimen, description or illustration as required by the Code'' (letter of 7th January 1963). Thus the "type" listed by Deignan has no such status, and the name Pardaliparus albescens McGregor continues to be available for a subspecies of *Parus elegans*, as used in the present paper.

An unfortunate error in my 1958 revision needs to be corrected. I wrote (Parkes, 1958: 96): "The Elegant Titmouse is the only species of its family to have reached a tropical archipelago." This, of course, was an inexcusable *lapsus*; there is another species of titmouse in the Philippines (Parus semilarvatus), and two species (Parus major and Melanochlora sultanea) occur in Malaysia.

References:

50, part 3, pp. xx + 1-801.

Baird, S. F. 1858. In Baird, S. F., J. Cassin, and G. N. Lawrence. Birds. Rep. Expl. and

Surv. R. R. Pac., vol. 9. Washington, D. C., pp. i-lvi + 1-1005.

Deignan, H. G. 1961. Type specimens of birds in the United States National Museum.

Bull. U.S.N.M., 221, pp. x + 1-718.

Parkes, K. C. 1958. A revision of the Philippine Elegant Titmouse (Parus elegans). Proc.

Biol. Soc. Washington, 71: 95-106. Rabor, D. S. 1959. The impact of deforestation on birds of Cebu, Philippines, with new

records for that island. Auk, 76: 37-43. Ridgway, R. 1904. The birds of North and Middle America, part 3. Bull. U.S.N.M.,

Notes on Ducula rosacea (Temminck) living on the Karimundjawa and Kangean Archipelagos

by A. Hoogerwerf

Received 16th July, 1962

Though there is some variation in the colour of nearly all parts of the plumage in birds from the same localities (even of birds with equally developed gonads) those differences are not very important in the specimens before me. Besides 19 birds from the Karimundiawa Archipelago among which are 16 freshly collected skins, we have five from the Kangean Islands, one from Bawean and seven old skins from more eastern localities, together with a bird from Billiton Island. We could not study any material from the Bay of Djakarta or the Thousand Islands (North of Djakarta), but the late Dr. G. C. A. Junge was so kind as to measure for me the six specimens from Djakarta Bay present in the Leyden Museum.

Besides the typical race known from many parts of Indonesia, the subspecies zamydrus (from Solombo and Arends Islands, eastern Java sea) and whartoni (Christmas Island) are known. This last race does not interest us here because of its much larger size, so that we may concentrate our attention on zamydrus. This subspecies was separated by Oberholser on account of its being "decidedly darker above, with the metallic sheen on interscapular region and posterior parts more evident (less overlaid

with gray)".

After comparing three Ducula rosacea from Karimundjawa, Chasen¹ wrote: "The characters relied upon for the separation of zamydrus are not of racial significance" because those Karimundjawa birds were paler and had the metallic sheen less obvious than a bird from Romah Island (Southwestern Islands, east of the Smaller Sunda Islands). But two years later in his Handlist of Malaysian Birds (1935) he includes Karimundjawa